

REMARKS

In the specification, the paragraph [0021] has been amended to correct minor editorial problems.

Claims 1-53 remain in this application. Claims 6-7, 17, 26-36, and 40 have been amended. Claims 13-18 and 37-51 have been withdrawn. Claims 52 and 53 have been added.

In view of the examiner's restriction requirement, the applicants retain the right to present claims 13-18 and 37-51 and the embodiment of figures 4-5 in a divisional application.

I. RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

A. Examiner's Statements

The examiner requires restriction to one of the following inventions under 35 U.S.C. § 121:

- I. Claims 1-12 and 19-36
- II. Claims 13-18 and 37-51

The examiner further requires the applicants to elect one of the following disclosed species for prosecution based on the merits:

- A. The embodiment of figures 1-2
- B. The embodiment of figures 4-5

B. Remarks

The applicants elect with traverse Group I, including claims 1-12 and 19-36 and Species A, including the embodiment of Figures 1-2. The applicants respectfully request that the examiner remove the restriction requirement to both the Groups and the Species.

Regarding the Groups I and II, the applicants have added claims 52 and 53 as linking claims that include "means" for practicing the processes claimed in claims 13 and 37. Therefore, the applicants respectfully request that the examiner remove the restriction requirement with respect to Groups I and II.

Regarding Species A and B, the applicants submit that the independent claims do not limit the number of winches, anchor lines, or anchors used with the buoy. The dependent claims relating to the number of winches, anchor lines, or anchors used by

the buoy vary in scope by first requiring only that "an" anchor winch, "an" anchor, and "an" anchor line be used. As is well known, the terms "a" or "an" designate "at least one". Thus, such claims encompass "one" as well as "more than one" anchor winch, anchor, and anchor line. Secondly, the dependent claims also specify systems that designate "more than one" anchor winch, anchor, and anchor line. The applicants respectfully submit that the scope of the first group encompasses the scope of the second group as well. Therefore, the applicants respectfully submit that the examiner remove the restriction requirement with respect to the Species A and B.

II. SPECIFICATION

The examiner objected to the disclosure because the last sentence of paragraph [0021] seemed to be missing words.

The applicants have amended paragraph [0021] above. Therefore, the applicants respectfully request that the examiner remove the objection of the specification.

III. CLAIM OBJECTIONS

The examiner objected to claims 26-36 because the preambles of the dependent claims refer to language not in the preamble of the related independent claim 19.

The applicants have amended claims 26-36 above. Therefore, the applicants respectfully request that the examiner remove the objection to claims 26-36.

IV. AMENDMENTS MADE NOT RELATED TO PATENTABILITY

The applicants have amended claims 6-7, 17, 30-31, and 40 to more clearly, correctly, and properly claim the invention and not for purposes of patentability.

These statements are not an admission that the other amendments were made for purposes of patentability, meant to be limiting in any way, or meant to be all-inclusive of amendments not made for purposes of patentability.

CONCLUSION

The applicants respectfully request reconsideration the pending claims and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite the resolution of this case, he is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned.


In the course of the foregoing discussions, the applicants may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular

claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. There may also be other distinctions between the claims and the prior art that have yet to be raised, but that may be raised in the future.

Unless the applicants have specifically stated that an amendment was made to distinguish the prior art, it was the intent of the amendment to further clarify and better define the claimed invention and the amendment was not for the purpose of patentability. Further, although the applicants may have amended certain claims, the applicants have not abandoned their pursuit of obtaining the allowance of these claims as originally filed and reserves, without prejudice, the right to pursue these claims in a continuing application.

If any fees are inadvertently omitted or if any additional fees are required or have been overpaid, please appropriately charge or credit those fees to Conley Rose, P.C. Deposit Account Number 03-2769 (ref. 1391-43100) of Conley Rose, P.C., Houston, Texas.

Respectfully submitted,
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.



Collin A. Rose
Reg. No. 47,036
P.O. Box 3267
Houston, TX 77253-3267
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)